

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on October 12, 2005. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interview, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-20 and 22-62 are pending. Claim 21 has been previously canceled. New claim 63 has been added without adding any new matter.

Claims 1-7, 10, 17-20, 22-25, 27-28, 31, 35-38, 41-43, 45, and 50-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruoff (U.S. 4,513,317), in view of Sisodia *et al.* (U.S. 6,312,129). Claims 3, 26, and 40 were rejected as being unpatentable as above in further view of Trumbull (U.S. 6,454,411). Claim 8 was rejected as being unpatentable over Ruoff and Sisodia in view of Richardson (U.S. 6,433,759). Claims 9, 11-16, 29-30, 32-22, 44, and 46-48 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ruoff and Sisodia in view of Molloy (U.S. 6,078,349). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the personal interview, the claims were discussed in view of the newly cited references. Applicant's representative proposed the claims be refined such that the first transmission channel be a broadcast channel for broadcasting the first image data to a plurality of users. The Examiner agreed that the prior art did not appear to teach any such feature. Accordingly, the existing claims have been amended to recite such a feature, and thus the rejection is moot and the amended claims are patentable over the cited references.

Furthermore, new claim 63 recites the step of "determining a *future* viewing area of the user utilizing said current viewing direction" wherein the "said second image data corresponds to an image area of the communication terminal predicted

Appl. No. 10/082,837
Amdt. Dated October 19, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 27, 2005

as *likely* being viewed by the user *in the future*" (emphasis added). This feature was discussed at the personal interview, as was the prior art which does not appear to teach any such feature. Accordingly, this new claim is also patentable over the references.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34415.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: October 19, 2005